

REMARKS

Claims 1-11 and 14-20 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 16 and 19 are amended and claims 12 and 13 are canceled. No new matter is added.

The courtesies extended to Applicants' representative by Examiner Shapiro at the interview held April 3, 2009, are appreciated. The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below, which constitute Applicants' record of the interview.

Claims 1-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. The Office Action alleges that some of the members of the group recited in the "wherein" clause at the end of claim 1 are either redundant or at odds with each other. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants respectfully assert that the members of the group are not at odds with each other because all of the members of the group define what is included within the term "retail store." Further, even if the members of the group are redundant or at odds with each other, which Applicants do not admit, it is not relevant because the group is optional due to the use of the word "or." Consequently, only one member of the group must be satisfied. Therefore the fact that one member of the group could allegedly preclude another member of the group does not render the claim indefinite.

It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 16-18 were rejected under rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, because the claims allegedly are indefinite because they recite both apparatus and method steps. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants respectfully assert that claim 16 is in the proper format for a machine-readable storage medium claim. Applicants respectfully assert that the nature of such a claim is that individual features of the claims, when viewed in isolation, may appear to be either an

apparatus or a method step. But when viewed in its entirety, the claim is clearly directed to an apparatus, that is, a machine-readable storage medium.

It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 16-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 for allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants respectfully assert that claims 16-18 are directed toward statutory subject matter because a machine-readable storage medium is an acceptable claim format. Please see MPEP §2106.01.

It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1-7 and 9-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Dobbins, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0063034, in view of Jones, U.S. Patent No. 6,128,402 (Jones 1). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites "the step of accepting the face value is limited to be less than a preset cash value." Claims 16 and 19 call for similar features.

In rejecting claim 13, the Office Action cites Dobbins at paragraph [0049], last four lines. As discussed during the personal interview, Applicants respectfully assert that one of ordinary skill in the art could not reasonably interpret Dobbins as teaching or suggesting the above referenced features of claims 1, 16 and 19 because the features cited in Dobbins refer to treating currency differently when it exceeds a certain value (i.e., 50 or 100 dollar bills). Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art would not reasonably interpret Dobbins as teaching or suggesting accepting the face value to be limited to be less than a preset cash value.

Jones 1 fails to overcome the deficiencies of Dobbins.

Claims 2-7, 9-15, 17, 18 and 20 are patentable by reason of their dependency from one of independent claims 1, 16 and 19, as well as for the additional features they recite.

It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Dobbins in view of Jones 1 and Jones, U.S. Patent No. 6,363,164 (Jones 2). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The rejection of claim 8 is premised upon Dobbins and Jones 1 teaching or suggesting all of the features of claim 1. As discussed above, Dobbins and Jones 1 fail to teach or suggest all of the features of claim 1. Further, Jones 2 fails to overcome the deficiencies of Dobbins and Jones 1. Thus, claim 8 is patentable by reason of its dependency from independent claim 1, as well as for the additional features it recites.


It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1-20 were provisionally rejected on the ground of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-20 of copending Application No. 10/524,109; claims 1-19 and 21 of copending Application No. 10/524,110; claims 1-19 and 24 of copending Application No. 10/524,111; claims 1-18, 23 and 35 of copending Application No. 10/524,112; claims 1-7, 9, 10 and 12-14 of copending Application No. 10/933,289; and claims 1-9, 11, 13-33, 35 and 37-45 of copending Application No. 11/117,563. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be held in abeyance until the final content of the claims has been determined.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Steven D. Jinks
Registration No. 62,760

JAO:SDJ/mkg

Date: April 7, 2009

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--